

## REMARKS

In the Official Action, original claims 1-20 were examined. Two objections were raised as to formal matters. The specification has been amended to address the informality raised in numbered paragraph 1 of the Detailed Action. Claim 6 has been amended to address the other informality raised in numbered paragraph 2 of the Detailed Action. Also, claims 8 and 14 were objected to, as dependent on rejected claims, whereas all other claims were rejected on prior art.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that the roll assembly is for decurling a printed graphic, and that the friction strip is permanently carried by the carrier sheet. It is self-evident that the description is directed to a decurling of a printed graphic (see also original claim 19); the friction strip is described as "attached" to the carrier sheet on page 3, line 20, but filmic material or a coating are also mentioned on page 7, line 4. Thus, "permanently carried" encompasses both a separate attached strip or a strip that has been coated.

Claims 2-14 remain in original form as depending from claim 1, except for the informalities corrected in claims 6 and 14. It is clear that original claim 14 should have depended from claim 13, which recites a composite carrier sheet. Inasmuch as claim 1 should now be allowed, the claims that depend therefrom should likewise be allowed.

Independent claims 15 and 17 have been amended to incorporate the new limitations in claim 1. These and the associated dependent claims recite dimensional relationships, frictional relationships, and/or the presence of the printed graphic in the roll assembly.

The total number of claims does not exceed 20, and the number of independent claims does not exceed three, so no additional fees are due.

Notwithstanding the foregoing amendments, applicant does not concede the propriety of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103. The foregoing amendments have been directed as the most expedient and cost-effective

manner to quickly obtain patent coverage on a product that is specifically directed to the field of graphic arts.

The object of the present invention is to enable an operator of a graphic arts enterprise to print an image on paper and render the printed paper flat in seconds, so that it can be shown to a customer, shipped, sold, or further processed with reliability and speed.

The substantive rejection is based solely on the disclosure of U.S. 6,416,013 (Benzing), which is directed to the manufacture of tires for automobiles and the like. With the amended preamble of all three independent claims, the cited reference is clearly in a non-analogous field of endeavor, and therefore incapable of teaching one of ordinary skill in the relevant field anything about the problem solved by applicant's invention.

Moreover, even the problem addressed by Benzing is different from that addressed by applicant. Benzing is merely trying to prevent adjacent windings of a large coil of spooled strip material 10 (the work piece), from deforming each other, despite the presence of an intermediate liner 12. There is no direct or indirect teaching or suggestion that the winding of the strips is useful for straightening or flattening the strips. To the contrary, the work piece is not to be deformed. The examiner's assertion that Benzig's liner 12 functionally corresponds to applicant's carrier sheet and the traction spacers 40 functionally corresponds to applicant's friction strips are without any technical foundation. As discussed in Benzig col. 3, ln. 25, the traction spacers have the function of spacing the strips 10 from each other. As mentioned at the end of page 3 of the specification, in applicant's invention the friction strips act as brakes against the adjacent underside of the carrier sheet when de-curling is taking place and stop the rolled up carrier sheet from unrolling prematurely due to the tremendous force generated from the action of decurling a heavy paper graphic on a roll of relatively small diameter. There is no comparable force generated in the loosely coiled spool of Benzig.

In any event, applicant has amended all independent claims to recite that the friction strips are permanently carried by the carrier sheet. This is in sharp

contrast with Benzig, where the spacers 40 are applied onto the liner 12 at the same time as the work piece 10 is applied on the liner. In particular, Benzig asserts that the spacers should be circumferentially stretchable relative to the liner (see Abstract).

In summary, Benzig is in a non-analogous field; the device of Benzig has a different purpose associated with a different type of workpiece; there is no suggestion in Benzig of how to solve applicant's particular problem of decurling (deforming) sheet material that has an inherent curl set from prior processing; and in any event, applicant's claimed combination of features as recited in independent claims 1, 15 and 17, is not disclosed, taught, or suggested.

Applicant encloses formal drawings herewith, and believes that all requirements for allowance of the application have been satisfied. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The undersigned urges the examiner to call if any issue arises that prevents prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Donald R. Dressler



L. James Ristas  
Registration No. 28,663  
Alix, Yale & Ristas, LLP  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 2, 2005  
750 Main Street  
Hartford, CT 06103-2721  
Our Ref: GLDES/121/US  
LJR:ds

\\Alix-pw3hy3s5je\AYR\AYR saved docs\Filing Docs\Gldes\gldes121us\gldes121us 05-02-05 amendment.doc